

Exhibit 6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
(SOUTHERN DIVISION)**

BOBBY SINGLETON, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**JOHN MERRILL, in his official
capacity as Alabama Secretary of State**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-01291-AMM

THREE-JUDGE COURT

EVAN MILLIGAN, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**JOHN MERRILL, in his official
capacity as Alabama Secretary of State**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-01530-AMM

MARCUS CASTER, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**JOHN MERRILL, in his official
capacity as Alabama Secretary of State**

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-1536-AMM

EXPERT REPORT OF M.V. HOOD III

I, M.V. Hood III, affirm the conclusions I express in this report are provided to a reasonable degree of professional certainty. In addition, I do hereby declare the following:

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

My name is M.V. (Trey) Hood III, and I am a tenured professor at the University of Georgia with an appointment in the Department of Political Science. I have been a faculty member at the University of Georgia since 1999. I also serve as the Director of the School of Public and International Affairs Survey Research Center. I am an expert in American politics, specifically in the areas of electoral politics, racial politics, election administration, and Southern politics. I teach courses on American politics, Southern politics, and research methods and have taught graduate seminars on the topics of election administration and Southern politics.

I have received research grants to study election administration issues from the National Science Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trust, and the Center for Election Innovation and Research. I have also published peer-reviewed journal articles specifically in the area of election administration, including redistricting. My academic publications are detailed in a copy of my vita that is attached to this report as Exhibit A. Currently, I serve on the editorial boards for *Social Science Quarterly* and *Election Law Journal*. The latter is a peer-reviewed academic journal focused on the area of election administration.

During the preceding five years, I have offered expert testimony (through deposition or at trial) in fifteen cases around the United States: *Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, 3:14-cv-00852 (E.D. Va.), *Common Cause v. Rucho*, 1:16-cv-1026 (M.D. N.C.), *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Merrill*, 2:15-cv-02193 (N.D. Ala.), *Anne Harding v. County of Dallas, Texas*, 3:15-cv-00131 (N.D. Tex.), *Feldman v. Arizona Secretary of State's Office*, 2:16-cv-16-01065 (Ariz.), *League of Women Voters v. Gardner*, 226-2017-cv-00433 (Hillsborough Superior Court), *Ohio A. Philip Randolph Institute v. Ryan Smith*, 1:18-cv-357 (S.D. Ohio), *Libertarian Party of Arkansas v. Thurston*, 4:19-cv-00214 (E.D. Ark.); *Chestnut v. Merrill*, 2:18-cv-907 (N.D. Ala.), *Common Cause v. Lewis*, 18-CVS-014001 (Wake County Superior Court); *Nielsen v. DeSantis*, 4:20-cv-236 (N.D. Fla.); *Western Native Voice v. Stapleton*, DV-56-2020-377 (Montana Thirteenth Judicial District Court); *Driscoll v. Stapleton*, DV-20-0408 (Montana Thirteenth Judicial District Court); and *North Carolina v. Holmes*, 18-CVS-15292 (Wake County Superior Court).

I am receiving \$400 an hour for my work on this case and \$400 an hour for any testimony associated with this work. In reaching my conclusions, I have drawn on my training, experience, and knowledge as a social scientist who has specifically conducted research in the area of redistricting. My compensation in this case is not dependent upon the outcome of the litigation or the substance of my opinions.

II. SCOPE AND OVERVIEW

I have been asked by counsel for the defendant to provide a functional analysis for District 7 in the congressional plan passed in 2021 and for Districts 6 and 7 from the plan proffered by the Singleton plaintiffs. These analyses are located in Section III of this report. I was also asked to briefly discuss the topic of white support for Republican minority candidates (Section IV). This report was prepared to meet the Court's December 10, 2021 deadline in contemplation of plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. I reserve the right to supplement this report later in this case following that hearing.

Note: Throughout this report I refer to different congressional plans. The plan challenged in this matter is referred to as the enacted plan, or the 2021 plan. The previous plan from 2011 is the benchmark plan and the plaintiffs' plan is the Singleton or whole county plan.

III. DISTRICT FUNCTIONALITY ANALYSES

In the recent case *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama* the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that, in relation to the use of race in redistricting, the pertinent question was to be found in Section 2, not Section 5, of the Voting Rights Act.¹ Specifically, the issue is not *how to maintain the present minority percentages in majority-minority districts, instead the issue is the extent to which [the State] must preserve existing minority percentages in order to maintain the minority's present ability to elect the candidate of its choice.*² Using this guidance I have undertaken a prospective vote dilution analysis using prongs two and three of the standard *Gingles* test.³ Unlike a typical Section 2 *Gingles* analysis that is a retrospective in nature, a Section 2 analysis examining a never before used district is, instead, a prospective matter. For the third prong the question is not whether a minority candidate of choice is typically defeated by a majority white voting bloc; such is not obviously the case in a new districting scheme. Instead, the germane question to pose is forward-looking: if said district is not constituted as a majority-minority district would it be the case in an open seat scenario that the preferred candidate of the black community would most likely be defeated?

To answer a question posed under such a scenario I rely on what is termed a district functionality analysis. Such an analysis can also be used to gain insight into how a proposed or enacted (but yet to be employed) district might operate prior to being used in an actual election. As none of the districts under analysis in this report have ever been employed in an election, I will be making use of past voting behavior to draw inferences about how these different district configurations might operate if used in an actual election scenario.

¹When Alabama redrew its legislative districts in 2012 the state was a covered jurisdiction under Section 5. At present, Section 5 is currently unenforceable.

²See *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 575 U.S. __ (2015). Page 4.

³See M.V. Hood III, Peter A. Morrison, and Thomas M. Bryan. 2017. "From Legal Theory to Practical Application: A How-To for Performing Vote Dilution Analyses." *Social Science Quarterly* for a discussion of how to conduct a Section 2 vote dilution analysis.

The functionality analyses presented in this expert report consist of several components which are then combined in a final step. First, one needs to estimate the manner in which various racial groups are voting. Here, I rely on precinct-level vote returns and racial turnout data to estimate how whites, blacks, and other minorities are casting ballots.⁴ More specifically, I analyze two state-level contests: the 2020 presidential election and the 2018 gubernatorial race. Ecological Inference is a statistical method that allows one to use aggregate-level data (precincts in this case) to make extrapolations concerning individual-level behavior. Using this technique one can determine the percentages of each racial group that voted for a particular candidate. Sometimes this step is referred to as a racially polarized voting (or racial bloc voting) analysis.

The next step in the process involves the application of turnout data by race. In the case of Alabama, the race of registrants is a known quantity. Using archived copies of the voter registration and history databases from the Alabama Secretary of State I was able to calculate voter turnout rates for whites, blacks, and other minorities by running a series of database queries. Registrants were aggregated into precincts which were, in turn, combined to estimate turnout for the various district configurations in question.

The final piece of requisite information concerns the racial population (VAP) breakdown of the district to be analyzed. These data are derived from reports based on the district population that rely on 2020 Census data. One can then take these voting age population figures and combine them with the aforementioned turnout data to derive an estimate of the number of white, black, and other minority voters to estimate turnout in a hypothetical election. Finally, one can combine these turnout numbers with the estimated vote percentages by race to derive vote share estimates. Aggregating these estimates one can determine the estimated vote share for each candidate. In the case of a general election, the process would terminate with a vote estimate for each political party in the race being analyzed. For example, what would be the estimated Democratic (Republican) vote share in said district.

The functionality analyses below address District 7 in the 2021 enacted plan and Districts 6 and 7 in the Singleton whole-county plan. Time did not permit a functionality analysis of the plan presented in the *Milligan* complaint.

⁴Outside of African Americans, all other minorities are grouped into a category labeled *Other*.

A. District 7: 2021 Enacted Plan

As drawn in 2011 and again in 2021, CD 7 is a majority-black VAP district currently represented by the Honorable Terry Sewell. The district was 60.55% black VAP in 2011 and in the current configuration is 54.22% BVAP—a drop of 6.3-points.⁵

2020 Presidential Election

The estimates in Table 1 below for enacted Congressional District 7 are based on the results from the 2020 presidential contest.

Table 1. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2020 Presidential Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Biden)	Republican Vote (Trump)	Independent Vote (Jorgenson)
Black	.9861 [.9829, .9886]	.0110 [.0084, .0142]	.0030 [.0023, .0037]
White	.1650 [.1540, .1756]	.8310 [.8203, .8417]	.0041 [.0031, .0051]
Other	.3182 [.1380, .5402]	.3419 [.1633, .4911]	.3399 [.2644, .4382]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 2 below, the enacted CD 7 is 54.22% black voting age population; 39.21% white voting age population, and 6.57% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for CD 7.

Table 2. Racial Breakdown for Enacted CD 7

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	54.22%	308,006
White VAP	39.21%	227,739
Other VAP	6.57%	37,322
Total		568,067

Next, I will make use of historical registration and turnout data from the Alabama Secretary of State. Data in Table 3 below are from the 2020 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in enacted CD 7 might resemble in a general election scenario.

Table 3. Turnout by Race for Enacted CD 7

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	308,006	57.93%	178,428
White VAP	222,739	63.62%	141,707
Other VAP	37,322	45.00%	16,795
Total	568,067		336,929

⁵Source: *Preclearance Submission of Alabama Act No. 2011-518* and report generated from Alabama Reapportionment Office.

Having come up with an estimate of what the electorate for enacted CD 7 might resemble, one can now combine these data with the estimated vote percentages by race in Table 1 in order to estimate vote shares by party (see Table 4).

Table 4. Estimated Vote by Party for Enacted CD 7

	(D)	(R)	(I)
Black	175,948	1,963	535
White	23,382	117,758	581
Other	5,344	5,742	5,709
Total	204,673	125,463	6,825
Vote Percentage	60.75%	37.24%	2.03%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the estimated percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in enacted CD 7. At 54.22% BVAP, enacted CD 7 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **60.75%** based on the results of the 2020 presidential election.

2018 Gubernatorial Election

The estimates in Table 5 below for enacted Congressional District 7 are based on the results from the 2018 gubernatorial contest.

Table 5. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2018 Gubernatorial Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Maddox)	Republican Vote (Ivey)
Black	.9732 [.9684, .9780]	.0268 [.0220, .0316]
White	.2633 [.2545, .2722]	.7367 [.7278, .7455]
Other	.7266 [.4838, .8845]	.2734 [.1155, .5162]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 6 below, the enacted CD 7 is 54.22% black voting age population; 39.21% white voting age population, and 6.57% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for CD 7.

Table 6. Racial Breakdown for Enacted CD 7

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	54.22%	308,006
White VAP	39.21%	227,739
Other VAP	6.57%	37,322
Total		568,067

Next, I will make use of historical registration and turnout data from the Alabama Secretary of State in order to estimate the number of each racial group. Data in Table 7 below are from the 2018 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in enacted CD 7 might resemble in an off-year general election scenario.

Table 7. Turnout by Race for Enacted CD 7

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	308,006	49.53%	152,555
White VAP	222,739	52.32%	116,537
Other VAP	37,322	35.55%	13,268
Total	568,067		282,360

Having come up with an estimate of what the electorate for enacted CD 7 might resemble, one can now combine these data with the estimated vote percentages by race in Table 5 in order to estimate vote shares by party (see Table 8).

Table 8. Estimated Vote by Party for Enacted CD 7

	(D)	(R)
Black	148,467	4,088
White	30,684	85,853
Other	9,641	3,627
Total	188,792	93,569
Vote Percentage	66.86%	33.14%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in enacted CD 7. At 54.22% BVAP, enacted CD 7 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **66.86%** based on the results of the 2018 gubernatorial election.

B. District 6: Singleton Plan

In this section I will present a functionality test for Congressional District 6 as proposed under the Singleton (also known as the Whole County) Plan. I will again present the results of an analysis relying on the 2018 gubernatorial and the 2020 presidential elections. As configured in the Singleton Plan, District 6 is 40.55% BVAP, 51.37% WVAP, and 8.08% other VAP.

2020 Presidential Election

The estimates in Table 9 below for Congressional District 6 (Singleton Plan) are based on the results from the 2020 presidential contest.

Table 9. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2020 Presidential Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Biden)	Republican Vote (Trump)	Independent Vote (Jorgenson)
Black	.9817 [.9739, .9871]	.0146 [.0093, .0225]	.0037 [.0025, .0050]
White	.2153 [.2055, .2243]	.7801 [.7710, .7900]	.0046 [.0035, .0058]
Other	.2756 [.1145, .4809]	.4152 [.1736, .5608]	.3093 [.2435, .4093]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 10 below, CD 6-Singleton is 40.55% black voting age population; 51.37% white voting age population, and 8.08% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for hypothetical CD 6.

Table 10. Racial Breakdown for Singleton CD 6

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	40.55%	228,233
White VAP	51.37%	289,132
Other VAP	8.08%	45,478
Total		562,843

Data in Table 11 use historical turnout and registration data from the 2020 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in Singleton CD 6 might resemble in a general election scenario.

Table 11. Turnout by Race for Enacted CD 6

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	228,233	62.19%	141,938
White VAP	289,132	67.80%	196,032
Other VAP	45,478	51.15%	23,262
Total	562,843		361,232

The turnout estimates from Table 11 and the estimated vote percentages from Table 9 are combined in Table 12 which presents estimates of hypothetical votes shares by political party.

Table 12. Estimated Vote by Party for Singleton CD 6

	(D)	(R)	(I)
Black	139,341	2,072	525
White	42,206	152,924	902
Other	6,411	9,658	7,195
Total	187,957	164,655	8,622
Vote Percentage	52.03%	45.58%	2.39%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the estimated percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in Singleton CD 6. At 40.55% BVAP, CD 6 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **52.03%** based on the results of the 2020 presidential election.

2018 Gubernatorial Election

The estimates in Table 13 below for enacted Singleton CD 6 are based on the results from the 2018 gubernatorial contest.

Table 13. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2018 Gubernatorial Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Maddox)	Republican Vote (Ivey)
Black	.9769 [.9694, .9837]	.0231 [.0163, .0306]
White	.3069 [.2987, .3140]	.6931 [.6860, .7013]
Other	.3987 [.1648, .6600]	.6013 [.3400, .8352]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 14 below, Singleton CD 6 is 40.55% black voting age population; 51.37% white voting age population, and 8.08% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for CD 6.

Table 14. Racial Breakdown for Singleton CD 6

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	40.55%	228,233
White VAP	51.37%	289,132
Other VAP	8.08%	45,478
Total		562,843

Next, I will make use of historical registration and turnout data from the Alabama Secretary of State in order to estimate the number of each racial group. Data in Table 15 below are from the 2018 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in Singleton CD 6 might resemble in an off-year general election scenario.

Table 15. Turnout by Race for Singleton CD 6

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	228,233	52.75%	120,393
White VAP	289,132	55.24%	159,717
Other VAP	45,478	40.42%	18,382
Total	562,843		298,492

Having come up with an estimate of what the electorate for Singleton CD 6 might resemble, one can now combine these data with the estimated vote percentages by race in Table 13 in order to estimate vote shares by party (see Table 16 below).

Table 16. Estimated Vote by Party for Singleton CD 6

	(D)	(R)
Black	117,612	2,781
White	49,017	110,700
Other	7,329	11,053
Total	173,958	124,534
Vote Percentage	58.28%	41.72%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in Singleton CD 6. At 40.55% BVAP, CD 6 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **58.28%** based on the results of the 2018 gubernatorial election.

C. District 7-Singleton Plan

In this section I will present a functionality test for Congressional District 7 as proposed under the Singleton (also known as the Whole County) Plan. I will again present the results of an analysis relying on the 2018 gubernatorial and the 2020 presidential elections. As configured in the Singleton Plan, District 7 is 45.82% BVAP, 47.24% WVAP, and 6.94% other VAP.

2020 Presidential Election

The estimates in Table 17 below for Congressional District 7 (Singleton Plan) are based on the results from the 2020 presidential contest.

Table 17. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2020 Presidential Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Biden)	Republican Vote (Trump)	Independent Vote (Jorgenson)
Black	.9838 [.9799, .9869]	.0123 [.0094, .0161]	.0038 [.0030, .0048]
White	.0925 [.0833, .1016]	.9035 [.8943, .9127]	.0040 [.0031, .0050]
Other	.4658 [.2945, .6030]	.2261 [.1126, .3812]	.3082 [.2400, .3949]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 18 below, CD 7-Singleton is 45.82% black voting age population; 47.24% white voting age population, and 6.94% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for hypothetical CD 7.

Table 18. Racial Breakdown for Singleton CD 7

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	45.82%	258,550
White VAP	47.24%	266,563
Other VAP	6.94%	39,161
Total		564,273

Data in Table 19 use historical turnout and registration data from the 2020 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in Singleton CD 7 might resemble in a general election scenario.

Table 19. Turnout by Race for Enacted CD 7

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	258,550	55.41%	143,262
White VAP	266,563	65.95%	175,798
Other VAP	39,161	43.84%	17,168
Total	564,273		336,228

The turnout estimates from Table 19 and the estimated vote percentages from Table 17 are combined in Table 20 which presents estimates of hypothetical votes shares by political party.

Table 20. Estimated Vote by Party for Singleton CD 7

	(D)	(R)	(I)
Black	140,942	1,762	544
White	16,261	158,834	703
Other	7,997	3,882	5,291
Total	165,200	164,477	6,539
Vote Percentage	49.13%	48.92%	1.94%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the estimated percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in Singleton CD 7. At 45.82% BVAP, CD 7 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **49.13%** based on the results of the 2020 presidential election.

2018 Gubernatorial Election

The estimates in Table 21 below for enacted Singleton CD 7 are based on the results from the 2018 gubernatorial contest.

Table 21. Estimated Vote Share by Race, 2018 Gubernatorial Election

Racial Group	Democratic Vote (Maddox)	Republican Vote (Ivey)
Black	.9698 [.9634, .9751]	.0302 [.0249, .0366]
White	.1861 [.1780, .1941]	.8139 [.8059, .8220]
Other	.7166 [.5320, .8455]	.2834 [.1545, .4680]

Notes: Entries are EI point estimates with 95% confidence intervals in brackets.

As displayed in Table 22 below, Singleton CD 7 is 45.82% black voting age population; 47.24% white voting age population, and 6.94% other voting age population. These figures represent the potential voting electorate for CD 7.

Table 22. Racial Breakdown for Singleton CD 7

Racial Group	Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	45.82%	258,550
White VAP	47.24%	266,563
Other VAP	6.94%	39,161
Total		564,273

Next, I will make use of historical registration and turnout data from the Alabama Secretary of State in order to estimate the number of each racial group. Data in Table 23 below are from the 2018 general election. The table below indicates what the electorate in Singleton CD 7 might resemble in an off-year general election scenario.

Table 23. Turnout by Race for Singleton CD 7

Racial Group	Electorate	Turnout Percent	Number of Voters
Black VAP	258,550	47.92%	123,897
White VAP	266,563	54.42%	145,063
Other VAP	39,161	32.52%	12,735
Total	564,273		281,695

Having come up with an estimate of what the electorate for Singleton CD 6 might resemble, one can now combine these data with the estimated vote percentages by race in Table 21 in order to estimate vote shares by party (see Table 24 below).

Table 24. Estimated Vote by Party for Singleton CD 7

	(D)	(R)
Black	120,155	3,742
White	26,996	118,067
Other	9,126	3,609
Total	156,278	125,418
Vote Percentage	55.48%	44.52%

Having produced an estimate of the number of Democratic votes, the last step in the process would be to simply divide this number by the size of the estimated electorate in order to determine the percentage of votes a Democratic candidate would receive in Singleton CD 7. At 45.82% BVAP, CD 7 would yield an estimated Democratic vote percentage of **55.48%** based on the results of the 2018 gubernatorial election.

D. Summary of Functionality Analyses

Here, I provide a summary of the primary findings from the functionality analyses undertaken in this section. Table 25 below details the estimated Democratic vote share for various district configurations under study.

Table 25. Estimated Democratic Vote Share

Plan	District	Election	Estimated (D) Vote
Enacted	CD 7	2018 Gubernatorial	66.86%
Enacted	CD 7	2020 Presidential	60.75%
Singleton	CD 6	2018 Gubernatorial	58.28%
Singleton	CD 6	2020 Presidential	52.03%
Singleton	CD 7	2018 Gubernatorial	55.48%
Singleton	CD 7	2020 Presidential	49.13%

For all of the functional analyses performed, racially polarized voting is present with black voters overwhelmingly supporting the Democratic candidate and more than a majority of white voters casting a ballot for the Republican candidate. Black voter support for Democratic candidates ranged from a low of 97.0% to a high of 98.6% (mean =97.9), while white support for Republican candidates ranged from 69.3% to 90.4% (mean=79.3).

Given the presence of racially polarized voting, enacted CD 7 which is drawn as a majority black district demonstrates a consistent ability to elect an African American candidate of choice (in this case the Democratic candidate). CD 6 and CD 7 under the Singleton Plan are not majority minority districts. As drawn, CD 6 and CD 7 could be characterized as black influence districts. It is not obvious, given a number of qualifications, whether the Singleton Plan might elect black candidate of choice in either of these proposed congressional districts. In CD 6 the estimated Democratic vote share hovers just above the fifty-percent mark for one contest analyzed and for CD 7 one estimate has the Democratic vote share below that level.

One proviso to consider concerns the fact that EI point estimates predicting voting behavior, like all statistical estimates, come with a range of uncertainty within which the true percentage is thought to lie (i.e. the confidence interval). For estimates that barely produce a Democratic vote plurality using the point estimates, as is the case in CD 7 (Singleton), an estimate relying on the lower confidence bound will reduce the Democratic vote share estimate. In some cases, the estimate may drop below a winning percentage.

A second caveat that should be considered in this redistricting cycle involves issues relating to the Census Bureau's application of a disclosure avoidance system in order to maintain privacy of individual Census records.⁶ As described succinctly by the National Conference of State Legislatures:

⁶2020 Decennial Census: Disclosure Avoidance Modernization (<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/planning-management/process/disclosure-avoidance.html>).

Differential privacy will mean that, except at the state level, population and voting age population will not be reported as enumerated. And, race and ethnicity data are likely to be farther from the “as enumerated” data than in past decades, when data swapping was used to protect small populations. (In 2010, at the block level, total population, total housing units, occupancy status, group quarters count and group quarters type were all held invariant.) This may raise issues for racial block voting analyses.⁷

The differential privacy system employed makes it impossible to count persons by racial/ethnic classification with 100% accuracy. Instead, it is likely that the actual percentage of a racial minority group in a newly drawn congressional district may actually differ from the reported percentage. Such a discrepancy could matter in the case of a district with high levels of racially polarized voting that produces a bare Democratic majority. If the racial composition of the district is, in actuality, below the reported level, the Democratic vote share would also be below the level calculated using the Census data.

Finally, one must also be mindful that the minority candidate of choice may differ in a Democratic primary as compared to a general election scenario where, as demonstrated, African Americans will support the Democratic nominee. In a Democratic primary, white and black voters may support different candidates. If there is an insufficient number of black voters to constitute a majority in a Democratic primary, the black community may be unable to elect their candidate of choice. If African Americans comprise a majority in a district, given identified voting proclivities, they will also make up a majority of a Democratic primary. Under such a scenario, the black community will also be able to elect their candidate of choice in the Democratic Primary. For districts where a minority group makes up a sizable share but less than a majority of the electorate, it may or may not be the case that the minority group is present in sufficient number to elect their candidate of choice in the Democratic Primary.⁸

⁷Quoted from National Conference of State Legislatures. “Differential Privacy for Census Data Explained.” (<https://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/differential-privacy-for-census-data-explained.aspx>).

⁸I had hoped to analyze some recent Democratic Primary elections as part of the functionality analyses presented in this report. Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain voter registration and history data from the Alabama Secretary of State for the 2018 or 2020 Democratic primary elections as these data were not available.

IV. WHITE SUPPORT FOR MINORITY REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Do white voters vote for minority Republican candidates? This was a research question that I analyzed in a peer-reviewed journal article. In this article, a co-author and myself examined the voting behavior of white voters as it related to support for minority GOP candidates in U.S. Senate and gubernatorial elections.⁹ In short, we found that white conservatives support minority Republican candidates at the same rates or at significantly higher rates than Anglo (non-Hispanic white) GOP nominees. In our study voting on the part of white conservatives is colorblind—the primary explanatory factor appears to be ideological congruence between the voter and the candidate. Stated succinctly, ideology trumps race in the case of white Republicans and their support for GOP minority nominees.

In Alabama specifically, Republican state house member Kenneth Paschal (HD 73) is one example of white voters electing a minority candidate. Paschal is an African American who ran in a Shelby County district which is 84.1% white VAP.¹⁰ Given the racial composition of HD 73, no candidate can win elective office without the support of white voters. In order to fill a vacancy for HD 73, a special Republican Primary was held on March 30, 2021 in which five candidates participated. In this contest Paschal came in second to Leigh Hulsey, a white candidate.¹¹ With no candidate in the primary having received a majority of the vote, Paschal and Hulsey were forced into a runoff. In the April 27th runoff, Paschal defeated Hulsey 51.1% to 48.9%.¹² Finally, Paschal faced a white Democrat, Sheridan Black, in the Special General Election held on July 13, 2021. In this contest, Paschal won with 74.7% of the vote to 25.1% for Black.¹³

⁹M.V. Hood III and Seth C. McKee. 2015. “True Colors: White Conservative Support for Minority Republican Candidates.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79(1): 28-52.

¹⁰Howard Koplowitz. “Kenneth Paschal Wins Alabama House Seat.” *AL.com*. July 14, 2021. *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama* (2:12-cv-00691). Document 337-1. Page 25.

¹¹Source: Alabama Secretary of State (<https://www.sos.alabama.gov/sites/default/files/election-2021/Certification%20of%20Primary%20Results.pdf>).


¹²Source: Alabama Secretary of State (https://www.sos.alabama.gov/sites/default/files/election-2021/HD73_Republican_Party-Certification_of_Results-Special_Primary_Runoff_Election.pdf)

¹³Source: Alabama Secretary of State (<https://www.sos.alabama.gov/sites/default/files/election-2021/Canvass%20of%20HD73%20Results.PD>).

V. DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on December 10, 2021.



M.V. (Trey) Hood III

Department of Political Science
School of Public and International Affairs
180 Baldwin Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
Phone: (706) 583-0554
FAX: (706) 542-4421
E-mail: th@uga.edu

Appendix: Data Sources

2018 and 2020 General Election Voter Registration and History Databases

Source: Alabama Secretary of State

2018 and 2020 General Election Precinct Vote Returns

Source: Alabama Secretary of State (<https://www.sos.alabama.gov/alabama-votes/voter/election-data>)

District-Level Population Data

Source: Alabama Reapportionment Office

District Configurations

Source: Alabama Reapportionment Office

Exhibit A

Curriculum Vitae
(December 2021)

M.V. (Trey) Hood III

Contact Information:

Department of Political Science
School of Public and International Affairs
180 Baldwin Hall
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Office Phone: (706) 583-0554
Dept. Phone: (706) 542-2057
Dept. FAX: (706) 542-4421
E-mail: th@uga.edu

Academic Positions:

University of Georgia

Director, SPIA Survey Research Center, 2016-present

Director of Graduate Studies, 2011-2016

Professor, 2013-present

Associate Professor, 2005-2013

Assistant Professor, 1999-2005

Texas Tech University

Visiting Assistant Professor, 1997-1999

Education:

Ph.D.	Political Science	Texas Tech University	1997
M.A.	Political Science	Baylor University	1993
B.S.	Political Science	Texas A&M University	1991

Peer-Reviewed Books:

Rural Republican Realignment in the Modern South: The Untold Story. Forthcoming May 2022.
Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

The Rational Southerner: Black Mobilization, Republican Growth, and the Partisan Transformation of the American South. 2012. New York: Oxford University Press.
(Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris, co-authors).
[Softcover version in 2014 with new Epilogue]

Peer-Reviewed Publications:

“Getting the Message: Opinion Polarization over Election Law.” Forthcoming 2022. *Election Law Journal*. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

- “Tracking Hispanic Political Emergence in Georgia: An Update.” 2021. *Social Science Quarterly* 102(1): 259-268. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Switching Sides but Still Fighting the Civil War in Southern Politics.” 2020 (Online). *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. (Christopher Cooper, Scott H. Huffmon, Quentin Kidd, Gibbs Knotts, Seth C. McKee, co-authors).
- “The Election of African American State Legislators in the Modern South.” 2020. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 45(4): 581-608. (Charles S. Bullock, III, William Hicks, Seth C. McKee, Adam S. Myers, and Daniel A. Smith, co-authors).
- “What’s in a Name? Gauging the Effect of Labels on Third Party Vote Shares.” 2020 (Online). *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Why Georgia, Why? Peach State Residents’ Perceptions of Voting-Related Improprieties and their Impact on the 2018 Gubernatorial Election.” 2019. *Social Science Quarterly* 100(5): 1828-1847. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Palmetto Postmortem: Examining the Effects of the South Carolina Voter Identification Statute.” 2019. *Political Research Quarterly* (Scott E. Buchanan, co-author).
- “Contagious Republicanism in Louisiana, 1966-2008.” 2018. *Political Geography* 66(Sept): 1-13. (Jamie Monogan, co-author).
- “The Comeback Kid: Donald Trump on Election Day in 2016.” 2019. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 52(2): 239-242. (Seth C. McKee and Daniel A. Smith, co-authors).
- “Election Daze: Mode of Voting and Voter Preferences in the 2016 Presidential Election.” 2017-2018. *Florida Political Chronicle* 25(2): 123-141. (Seth C. McKee and Daniel A. Smith, co-authors).
- “Out of Step and Out of Touch: The Matter with Kansas in the 2014 Midterm.” 2017. *The Forum* 15(2): 291-312. (Seth C. McKee and Ian Ostrander, co-authors).
- “From Legal Theory to Practical Application: A How-To for Performing Vote Dilution Analyses.” 2018. *Social Science Quarterly* 99(2): 536-552. (Peter A. Morrison and Thomas M. Bryan, co-authors).
- “Race, Class, Religion and the Southern Party System: A Field Report from Dixie.” 2016. *The Forum* 14(1): 83-96.
- “Black Votes Count: The 2014 Republican Senate Nomination in Mississippi.” 2017. *Social Science Quarterly* 98(1): 89-106. (Seth C. McKee, coauthor).
- “Sunshine State Dilemma: Voting for the 2014 Governor of Florida.” 2015. *Electoral Studies* 40: 293-299. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

- “Tea Leaves and Southern Politics: Explaining Tea Party Support Among Southern Republicans.” 2015. *Social Science Quarterly* 96(4): 923-940. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris, co-authors).
- “True Colors: White Conservative Support for Minority Republican Candidates.” 2015. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79(1): 28-52. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Race and the Tea Party in the Old Dominion: Split-Ticket Voting in the 2013 Virginia Elections.” 2015. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48(1):107-114. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris, co-authors).
- “The Damnedest Mess: An Empirical Evaluation of the 1966 Georgia Gubernatorial Election.” 2014. *Social Science Quarterly* 96(1):104-118. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Candidates, Competition, and the Partisan Press: Congressional Elections in the Early Antebellum Era.” 2014. *American Politics Research* 42(5):670-783. (Jamie L. Carson, co-author).
[Winner of the 2014 Hahn-Sigelman Prize]
- “Strategic Voting in a U.S. Senate Election.” 2013. *Political Behavior* 35(4):729-751. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Unwelcome Constituents: Redistricting and Countervailing Partisan Tides.” 2013. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 13(2):203-224. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “The Tea Party, Sarah Palin, and the 2010 Congressional Elections: The Aftermath of the Election of Barack Obama.” 2012. *Social Science Quarterly* 93(5):1424-1435. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Much Ado About Nothing?: An Empirical Assessment of the Georgia Voter Identification Statute.” 2012. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 12(4):394-314. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Achieving Validation: Barack Obama and Black Turnout in 2008.” 2012. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 12:3-22. (Seth C. McKee and David Hill, co-authors).
- “They Just Don’t Vote Like They Used To: A Methodology to Empirically Assess Election Fraud.” 2012. *Social Science Quarterly* 93:76-94. (William Gillespie, co-author).
- “An Examination of Efforts to Encourage the Incidence of Early In-Person Voting in Georgia, 2008.” 2011. *Election Law Journal* 10:103-113. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “What Made Carolina Blue? In-migration and the 2008 North Carolina Presidential Vote.” 2010. *American Politics Research* 38:266-302. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

- “Stranger Danger: Redistricting, Incumbent Recognition, and Vote Choice.” 2010. *Social Science Quarterly* 91:344-358. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Trying to Thread the Needle: The Effects of Redistricting in a Georgia Congressional District.” 2009. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42:679-687. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Citizen, Defend Thyself: An Individual-Level Analysis of Concealed-Weapon Permit Holders.” 2009. *Criminal Justice Studies* 22:73-89. (Grant W. Neeley, co-author).
- “Two Sides of the Same Coin?: Employing Granger Causality Tests in a Time Series Cross-Section Framework.” 2008. *Political Analysis* 16:324-344. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris, co-authors).
- “Worth a Thousand Words? : An Analysis of Georgia’s Voter Identification Statute.” 2008. *American Politics Research* 36:555-579. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Gerrymandering on Georgia’s Mind: The Effects of Redistricting on Vote Choice in the 2006 Midterm Election.” 2008. *Social Science Quarterly* 89:60-77 (Seth C. McKee, co-author).
- “Examining Methods for Identifying Latino Voters.” 2007. *Election Law Journal* 6:202-208. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “A Mile-Wide Gap: The Evolution of Hispanic Political Emergence in the Deep South.” 2006. *Social Science Quarterly* 87:1117-1135. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “Punch Cards, Jim Crow, and Al Gore: Explaining Voter Trust in the Electoral System in Georgia, 2000.” 2005. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 5:283-294. (Charles S. Bullock, III and Richard Clark, co-authors).
- “When Southern Symbolism Meets the Pork Barrel: Opportunity for Executive Leadership.” 2005. *Social Science Quarterly* 86:69-86. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “The Reintroduction of the *Elephas maximus* to the Southern United States: The Rise of Republican State Parties, 1960-2000.” 2004. *American Politics Research* 31:68-101. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris, co-authors).
- “One Person, [No Vote; One Vote; Two Votes...]: Voting Methods, Ballot Types, and Undervote Frequency in the 2000 Presidential Election.” 2002. *Social Science Quarterly* 83:981-993. (Charles S. Bullock, III, co-author).
- “On the Prospect of Linking Religious Right Identification with Political Behavior: Panacea or Snipe Hunt?” 2002. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41:697-710. (Mark C. Smith, co-author).

- “The Key Issue: Constituency Effects and Southern Senators’ Roll-Call Voting on Civil Rights.” 2001. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26: 599-621. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris, co-authors).
- “Packin’ in the Hood?: Examining Assumptions Underlying Concealed-Handgun Research.” 2000. *Social Science Quarterly* 81:523-537. (Grant Neeley, co-author).
- “Brother, Can You Spare a Dime? Racial/Ethnic Context and the Anglo Vote on Proposition 187.” 2000. *Social Science Quarterly* 81:194-206. (Irwin Morris, co-author).
- “Penny Pinching or Politics? The Line-Item Veto and Military Construction Appropriations.” 1999. *Political Research Quarterly* 52:753-766. (Irwin Morris and Grant Neeley, co-authors).
- “Of Byrds[s] and Bumpers: Using Democratic Senators to Analyze Political Change in the South, 1960-1995.” 1999. *American Journal of Political Science* 43:465-487. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris, co-authors).
- “Bugs in the NRC’s Doctoral Program Evaluation Data: From Mites to Hissing Cockroaches.” 1998. *PS* 31:829-835. (Nelson Dometrius, Quentin Kidd, and Kurt Shirkey, co-authors).
- “Boll Weevils and Roll-Call Voting: A Study in Time and Space.” 1998. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23:245-269. (Irwin Morris, co-author).
- “Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor,...But Make Sure They Have a Green Card: The Effects of Documented and Undocumented Migrant Context on Anglo Opinion Towards Immigration.” 1998. *Political Behavior* 20:1-16. (Irwin Morris, co-author).
- “¡Quedate o Vente!: Uncovering the Determinants of Hispanic Public Opinion Towards Immigration.” 1997. *Political Research Quarterly* 50:627-647. (Irwin Morris and Kurt Shirkey, co-authors).
- “¿Amigo o Enemigo?: Context, Attitudes, and Anglo Public Opinion toward Immigration.” 1997. *Social Science Quarterly* 78: 309-323. (Irwin Morris, co-author).

Invited Publications:

- “Race and the Ideological Transformation of the Democratic Party: Evidence from the Bayou State.” 2005. *American Review of Politics* 25:67-78.

Book Chapters:

- “The 2020 Presidential Nomination Process.” 2021. In *The 2020 Presidential Election in the South*, eds. Branwell DuBose Kapeluck and Scott E. Buchanan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. (Aaron A. Hitefield, co-author).

“Texas: A Shifting Republican Terrain.” 2021. In *The New Politics of the Old South*, 7th ed., Charles S. Bullock, III and Mark J. Rozell, editors. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

“Texas: Big Red Rides On.” 2018. In *The New Politics of the Old South*, 6th ed., Charles S. Bullock, III and Mark J. Rozell, editors. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

“The Participatory Consequences of Florida Redistricting.” 2015. In *Jigsaw Puzzle Politics in the Sunshine State*, Seth C. McKee, editor. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press. (Danny Hayes and Seth C. McKee, co-authors).

“Texas: Political Change by the Numbers.” 2014. In *The New Politics of the Old South*, 5th ed., Charles S. Bullock, III and Mark J. Rozell, editors. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Seth C. McKee, co-author).

“The Republican Party in the South.” 2012. In *Oxford Handbook of Southern Politics*, Charles S. Bullock, III and Mark J. Rozell, editors. New York: Oxford University Press. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris, co-authors).

“The Reintroduction of the *Elephas maximus* to the Southern United States: The Rise of Republican State Parties, 1960-2000.” 2010. In *Controversies in Voting Behavior*, 5th ed., David Kimball, Richard G. Niemi, and Herbert F. Weisberg, editors. Washington, DC: CQ Press. (Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris, co-authors).
[Reprint of 2004 *APR* article with Epilogue containing updated analysis and other original material.]

“The Texas Governors.” 1997. In *Texas Policy and Politics*, Mark Somma, editor. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Book Reviews:

The Resilience of Southern Identity: Why the South Still Matters in the Minds of Its People. 2018.
Reviewed for *The Journal of Southern History*.

Other Publications:

“Provisionally Admitted College Students: Do They Belong in a Research University?” 1998. In *Developmental Education: Preparing Successful College Students*, Jeanne Higbee and Patricia L. Dwinell, editors. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition (Don Garnett, co-author).

NES Technical Report No. 52. 1994. “The Reliability, Validity, and Scalability of the Indicators of Gender Role Beliefs and Feminism in the 1992 American National Election Study: A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers.” (Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Douglas R. Davenport, Terry L. Gilmour, William R. Moore, Kurt Shirkey, co-authors).

Grant-funded Research (UGA):

Co-Principal Investigator. “Georgia Absentee Ballot Signature Verification Study.” Budget: \$36,950. 2021. (with Audrey Haynes and Charles Stewart III). Funded by the Georgia Secretary of State.

Co-Principal Investigator. “The Integrity of Mail Voting in the 2020 Election.” Budget: \$177,080. (with Lonna Atkeson and Robert Stein). Funded by the National Science Foundation.

Co-Principal Investigator. “Georgia Voter Verification Study.” Budget: \$52,060. 2020. (with Audrey Haynes). Funded by Center for Election Innovation and Research.

Co-Principal Investigator. “An Examination of Non-Precinct Voting in the State of Georgia.” Budget: \$47,000. October 2008-July 2009. (with Charles S. Bullock, III). Funded by the Pew Charitable Trust.

Co-Principal Investigator. “The Best Judges Money Can Buy?: Campaign Contributions and the Texas Supreme Court.” (SES-0615838) Total Budget: \$166,576; UGA Share: \$69,974. September 2006-August 2008. (with Craig F. Emmert). Funded by the National Science Foundation. REU Supplemental Award (2008-2009): \$6,300.

Principal Investigator. “Payola Justice or Just Plain ‘Ole Politics Texas-Style?: Campaign Finance and the Texas Supreme Court.” \$5,175. January 2000-Januray 2001. Funded by the University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc.

Curriculum Grants (UGA):

Learning Technology Grant: “Converting Ideas Into Effective Action: An Interactive Computer and Classroom Simulation for the Teaching of American Politics.” \$40,000. January-December 2004. (with Loch Johnson). Funded by the Office of Instructional Support and Technology, University of Georgia.

Dissertation:

“Capturing Bubba's Heart and Mind: Group Consciousness and the Political Identification of Southern White Males, 1972-1994.”

Chair: Professor Sue Tolleson-Rinehart

Papers and Activities at Professional Meetings:

“Rural Voters in Southern U.S. House Elections.” 2021. (with Seth C. McKee). Presented at the Virtual American Political History Conference. University of Georgia. Athens, GA.

“Mail It In: An Analysis of the Peach State’s Response to the Coronavirus Pandemic.” 2020. (with Audrey Haynes). Presented at the Election Science, Reform, and Administrative Conference. Gainesville, FL. [Virtually Presented].

“Presidential Republicanism and Democratic Darn Near Everything Else.” 2020. (with Seth C. McKee). Presented at the Citadel Southern Politics Symposium. Charleston, SC.

“Why Georgia, Why? Peach State Residents’ Perceptions of Voting-Related Improprieties and their Impact on the 2018 Gubernatorial Election.” 2019. (with Seth C. McKee). Presented at the Election Science, Reform, and Administrative Conference. Philadelphia, PA.

“The Demise of White Class Polarization and the Newest American Politics.” 2019. (with Seth C. McKee). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Austin, TX.

“The Geography of Latino Growth in the American South.” 2018. (with Seth C. McKee). State Politics and Policy Conference. State College, PA.

“A History and Analysis of Black Representation in Southern State Legislatures.” 2018. (with Charles S. Bullock, III, William D. Hicks, Seth C. McKee, Adam S. Myers, and Daniel A. Smith). Presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

Discussant. Panel titled “Southern Distinctiveness?” 2018. The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

Roundtable Participant. Panel titled “The 2018 Elections.” 2018. The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Still Fighting the Civil War?: Southern Opinions on the Confederate Legacy.” 2018. (with Christopher A. Cooper, Scott H. Huffman, Quentin Kidd, H. Gibbs Knotts, and Seth C. McKee). The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Tracking Hispanic Growth in the American South.” 2018. (with Seth C. McKee). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

“An Assessment of Online Voter Registration in Georgia.” 2017. (with Greg Hawrelak and Colin Phillips). Presented at the Annual Meeting of Election Sciences, Reform, and Administration. Portland, Oregon.

Moderator. Panel titled “What Happens Next.” 2017. The Annual Meeting of Election Sciences, Reform, and Administration. Portland, Oregon.

“Election Daze: Time of Vote, Mode of Voting, and Voter Preferences in the 2016 Presidential Election.” 2017. (with Seth C. McKee and Dan Smith). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the State Politics and Policy Conference. St. Louis, MO.

“Palmetto Postmortem: Examining the Effects of the South Carolina Voter Identification Statute.” 2017. (with Scott E. Buchanan). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

Panel Chair and Presenter. Panel titled “Assessing the 2016 Presidential Election.” 2017. UGA Elections Conference. Athens, GA.

Roundtable Discussant. Panel titled “Author Meets Critics: Robert Mickey's Paths Out of Dixie.” 2017. The Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

“Out of Step and Out of Touch: The Matter with Kansas in the 2014 Midterm Election.” (with Seth C. McKee and Ian Ostrander). 2016. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

“Contagious Republicanism in North Carolina and Louisiana, 1966-2008.”(with Jamie Monogan). 2016. Presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“The Behavioral Implications of Racial Resentment in the South: The Intervening Influence of Party.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2016. Presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

Discussant. Panel titled “Partisan Realignment in the South.” 2016. The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Electoral Implications of Racial Resentment in the South: The Influence of Party.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2016. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Philadelphia, PA.

“Racial Resentment and the Tea Party: Taking Regional Differences Seriously.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2015. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. San Francisco, CA.

“Race and the Tea Party in the Palmetto State: Tim Scott, Nikki Haley, Bakari Sellers and the 2014 Elections in South Carolina.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2015. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

Participant. Roundtable on the 2014 Midterm Elections in the Deep South. Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

“Race and the Tea Party in the Old Dominion: Split-Ticket Voting in the 2013 Virginia Elections.” (with Irwin L. Morris and Quentin Kidd). 2014. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Race and the Tea Party in the Old Dominion: Down-Ticket Voting and Roll-Off in the 2013 Virginia Elections.” (with Irwin L. Morris and Quentin Kidd). 2014. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.

- “Tea Leaves and Southern Politics: Explaining Tea Party Support Among Southern Republicans.” (with Irwin L. Morris and Quentin Kidd). 2013. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Orlando, FL.
- “The Tea Party and the Southern GOP.” (with Irwin L. Morris and Quentin Kidd). 2012. Research presented at the Effects of the 2012 Elections Conference. Athens, GA.
- “Black Mobilization in the Modern South: When Does Empowerment Matter?” (with Irwin L. Morris and Quentin Kidd). 2012. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.
- “The Legislature Chooses a Governor: Georgia’s 1966 Gubernatorial Election.” (with Charles S. Bullock, III). 2012. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.
- “One-Stop to Victory? North Carolina, Obama, and the 2008 General Election.” (with Justin Bullock, Paul Carlsen, Perry Joiner, and Mark Owens). 2011. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans.
- “Redistricting and Turnout in Black and White.” (with Seth C. McKee and Danny Hayes). 2011. Paper presented the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago, IL.
- “One-Stop to Victory? North Carolina, Obama, and the 2008 General Election.” (with Justin Bullock, Paul Carlsen, Perry Joiner, Jeni McDermott, and Mark Owens). 2011. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association Meeting. Chicago, IL.
- “Strategic Voting in the 2010 Florida Senate Election.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2011. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Political Science Association. Jupiter, FL.
- “The Republican Bottleneck: Congressional Emergence Patterns in a Changing South.” (with Christian R. Grose and Seth C. McKee). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans, LA.
- “Capturing the Obama Effect: Black Turnout in Presidential Elections.” (with David Hill and Seth C. McKee) 2010. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Political Science Association. Jacksonville, FL.
- “The Republican Bottleneck: Congressional Emergence Patterns in a Changing South.” (with Seth C. McKee and Christian R. Grose). 2010. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.
- “Black Mobilization and Republican Growth in the American South: The More Things Change the More They Stay the Same?” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2010. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Unwelcome Constituents: Redistricting and Incumbent Vote Shares.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2010. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta, GA.

“Black Mobilization and Republican Growth in the American South: The More Things Change the More They Stay the Same?” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2010. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta, GA.

“The Impact of Efforts to Increase Early Voting in Georgia, 2008.” (With Charles S. Bullock, III). 2009. Presentation made at the Annual Meeting of the Georgia Political Science Association. Callaway Gardens, GA.

“Encouraging Non-Precinct Voting in Georgia, 2008.” (With Charles S. Bullock, III). 2009. Presentation made at the Time-Shifting The Vote Conference. Reed College, Portland, OR.

“What Made Carolina Blue? In-migration and the 2008 North Carolina Presidential Vote.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2009. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Political Science Association. Orlando, FL.

“Swimming with the Tide: Redistricting and Voter Choice in the 2006 Midterm.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2009. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.

“The Effect of the Partisan Press on U.S. House Elections, 1800-1820.” (with Jamie Carson). 2008. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the History of Congress Conference. Washington, D.C.

“Backward Mapping: Exploring Questions of Representation via Spatial Analysis of Historical Congressional Districts.” (Michael Crespín). 2008. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the History of Congress Conference. Washington, D.C.

“The Effect of the Partisan Press on U.S. House Elections, 1800-1820.” (with Jamie Carson). 2008. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.

“The Rational Southerner: The Local Logic of Partisan Transformation in the South.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2008. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Stranger Danger: The Influence of Redistricting on Candidate Recognition and Vote Choice.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2008. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans.

“Backward Mapping: Exploring Questions of Representation via Spatial Analysis of Historical Congressional Districts.” (with Michael Crespin). 2007. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Chicago.

“Worth a Thousand Words? : An Analysis of Georgia’s Voter Identification Statute.” (with Charles S. Bullock, III). 2007. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association. Albuquerque.

“Gerrymandering on Georgia’s Mind: The Effects of Redistricting on Vote Choice in the 2006 Midterm Election.” (with Seth C. McKee). 2007. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of The Southern Political Science Association. New Orleans.

“Personalismo Politics: Partisanship, Presidential Popularity and 21st Century Southern Politics.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2006. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Philadelphia.

“Explaining Soft Money Transfers in State Gubernatorial Elections.” (with William Gillespie and Troy Gibson). 2006. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.

“Two Sides of the Same Coin?: A Panel Granger Analysis of Black Electoral Mobilization and GOP Growth in the South, 1960-2004.” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2006. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston, SC.

“Hispanic Political Emergence in the Deep South, 2000-2004.” (With Charles S. Bullock, III). 2006. Paper presented at the Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. Charleston.

“Black Mobilization and the Growth of Southern Republicanism: Two Sides of the Same Coin?” (with Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). 2006. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.

“Exploring the Linkage Between Black Turnout and Down-Ticket Challenges to Black Incumbents.” (With Troy M. Gibson). 2006. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.

“Race and the Ideological Transformation of the Democratic Party: Evidence from the Bayou State.” 2004. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Citadel Southern Politics Symposium. Charleston.

“Tracing the Evolution of Hispanic Political Emergence in the Deep South.” 2004. (Charles S. Bullock, III). Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Citadel Southern Politics Symposium. Charleston.

- “Much Ado about Something? Religious Right Status in American Politics.” 2003. (With Mark C. Smith). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “Tracking the Flow of Non-Federal Dollars in U. S. Senate Campaigns, 1992-2000.” 2003. (With Janna Deitz and William Gillespie). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “PAC Cash and Votes: Can Money Rent a Vote?” 2002. (With William Gillespie). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Savannah.
- “What Can Gubernatorial Elections Teach Us About American Politics?: Exploiting and Underutilized Resource.” 2002. (With Quentin Kidd and Irwin L. Morris). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Boston.
- “I Know I Voted, But I’m Not Sure It Got Counted.” 2002. (With Charles S. Bullock, III and Richard Clark). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association. New Orleans.
- “Race and Southern Gubernatorial Elections: A 50-Year Assessment.” 2002. (With Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris). Paper presented at the Biennial Southern Politics Symposium. Charleston, SC.
- “Top-Down or Bottom-Up?: An Integrated Explanation of Two-Party Development in the South, 1960-2000.” 2001. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- “Cash, Congress, and Trade: Did Campaign Contributions Influence Congressional Support for Most Favored Nation Status in China?” 2001. (With William Gillespie). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association. Fort Worth.
- “Key 50 Years Later: Understanding the Racial Dynamics of 21st Century Southern Politics” 2001. (With Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- “The VRA and Beyond: The Political Mobilization of African Americans in the Modern South.” 2001. (With Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. San Francisco.
- “Payola Justice or Just Plain ‘Ole Politics Texas Style?: Campaign Finance and the Texas Supreme Court.” 2001. (With Craig Emmert). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “The VRA and Beyond: The Political Mobilization of African Americans in the Modern South.” 2000. (With Irwin Morris and Quentin Kidd). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.

- “Where Have All the Republicans Gone? A State-Level Study of Southern Republicanism.” 1999. (With Irwin Morris and Quentin Kidd). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Savannah.
- “Elephants in Dixie: A State-Level Analysis of the Rise of the Republican Party in the Modern South.” 1999. (With Irwin Morris and Quentin Kidd). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- “Stimulant to Turnout or Merely a Convenience?: Developing an Early Voter Profile.” 1998. (With Quentin Kidd and Grant Neeley). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- “The Impact of the Texas Concealed Weapons Law on Crime Rates: A Policy Analysis for the City of Dallas, 1992-1997.” 1998. (With Grant W. Neeley). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “Analyzing Anglo Voting on Proposition 187: Does Racial/Ethnic Context Really Matter?” 1997. (With Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Norfolk.
- “Capturing Bubba's Heart and Mind: Group Consciousness and the Political Identification of Southern White Males, 1972-1994.” 1997. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “Of Byrds[s] and Bumpers: A Pooled Cross-Sectional Study of the Roll-Call Voting Behavior of Democratic Senators from the South, 1960-1995.” 1996. (With Quentin Kidd and Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- “Pest Control: Southern Politics and the Eradication of the Boll Weevil.” 1996. (With Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. San Francisco.
- “Fit for the Greater Functions of Politics: Gender, Participation, and Political Knowledge.” 1996. (With Terry Gilmour, Kurt Shirkey, and Sue Tolleson-Rinehart). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “¿Amigo o Enemigo?: Racial Context, Attitudes, and White Public Opinion on Immigration.” 1996. (With Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.
- “¡Quedate o Vente!: Uncovering the Determinants of Hispanic Public Opinion Towards Immigration.” 1996. (With Irwin Morris and Kurt Shirkey). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association. Houston.

“Downs Meets the Boll Weevil: When Southern Democrats Turn Left.” 1995. (With Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Tampa.

“¿Amigo o Enemigo?: Ideological Dispositions of Whites Residing in Heavily Hispanic Areas.” 1995. (With Irwin Morris). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Tampa.

Chair. Panel titled “Congress and Interest Groups in Institutional Settings.” 1995. Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association. Dallas.

“Death of the Boll Weevil?: The Decline of Conservative Democrats in the House.” 1995. (With Kurt Shirkey). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association. Dallas.

“Capturing Bubba’s Heart and Mind: The Political Identification of Southern White Males.” 1994. (With Sue Tolleson-Rinehart). Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.

Areas of Teaching Competence:

American Politics: Behavior and Institutions

Public Policy

Scope, Methods, Techniques

Teaching Experience:

University of Georgia, 1999-present.

Graduate Faculty, 2003-present.

Provisional Graduate Faculty, 2000-2003.

Distance Education Faculty, 2000-present.

Texas Tech University, 1993-1999.

Visiting Faculty, 1997-1999.

Graduate Faculty, 1998-1999.

Extended Studies Faculty, 1997-1999.

Teaching Assistant, 1993-1997.

Courses Taught:

Undergraduate:

American Government and Politics, American Government and Politics (Honors), Legislative Process, Introduction to Political Analysis, American Public Policy, Political Psychology, Advanced Simulations in American Politics (Honors), Southern Politics, Southern Politics (Honors), Survey Research Internship

Graduate:

Election Administration and Related Issues (Election Sciences), Political Parties and Interest

Groups, Legislative Process, Seminar in American Politics, Southern Politics; Publishing for Political Science

Editorial Boards:

Social Science Quarterly. Member. 2011-present.

Election Law Journal. Member. 2013-present.

Professional Service:

Listed expert. MIT Election Data and Science Lab.

Keynote Address. 2020 Symposium on Southern Politics. The Citadel. Charleston, SC.

Institutional Service (University-Level):

University Promotion and Tenure Committee, 2019-2022.

University Program Review Committee, 2009-2011.

Chair, 2010-2011

Vice-Chair, 2009-2010.

Graduate Council, 2005-2008.

Program Committee, 2005-2008.

Chair, Program Committee, 2007-2008.

University Libraries Committee, 2004-2014.

Search Committee for University Librarian and Associate Provost, 2014.